Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004. The fee for addition of new claims is included herewith. A Petition for Extension of Time is also submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I.   Summary of Examiners Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, Claims 1-40 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, the Specification was objected to for various informalities. Claims 7, 11, 17, 27 and 37 were also objected for various informalities. Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195, hereafter Goodwin).

II.   Summary of Applicants' Amendment

The present Response amends the Specification. The present Response also amends Claims 1, 6 and 8; cancels Claims 3-5, 7 , 11-40; and adds new Claims 41-55, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10 and 41-55. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III.   Specification

In the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, the Specification was objected to for various informalities. In particular, the Specification was objected to for the use of various trademarks without sufficient identification of such. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Specification as described above to identify any trademarks used therein and to attribute those trademarks to their proper owners. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments are to correct the aforementioned informalities in the Specification, and that no new matter is being added.

- 10 -

IV.   Claim Objections

In the Office mailed December 23, 2004, Claims 7, 11, 17, 27 and 37 were objected for various informalities. The present Response cancels claims 7, 11, 17, 27 and 37, rendering moot the objections to these claims.

V.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodwin (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

> 1.   *(Currently Amended) A system for software application development and modeling, capable of being integrated with a software application design modeling tool, comprising:*
>
> *an expert system for automatically*
> *reading a software application design UML model conforming to the software application design model tool,*
> *reading a one or plurality of target application server design patterns,*
> *enhancing the software application design UML model to conform to the target application server design patterns, and*
> *generating code implementations for the target application server defined by the enhanced software application design UML model; and,*
>
> *an interface to a software application design modeling tool for modeling said software application design UML model, wherein said modeling includes said reading of software application design UML model, said enhancing of software application design UML model, and said generating code implementations.*

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines a system for software application development and modeling, capable of being integrated with a software application design modeling tool. An expert system reads a software application design UML model conforming to the software application

design model tool, together with a target application server design pattern, and automatically enhances the software application design UML model to conform to the target application server design patterns. The system then automatically generates code implementations for the target application server defined by the enhanced software application design UML model.

The advantages of the system defined by Claim 1 include that the expert system automates enhancing the ideal object model (the software application design UML model) into an implementation object model (conforming to target application server design patterns) that describes the actual classes in the implementation of the application. The system then generates the appropriate code (target application server code). Another advantage is that the expert system provides an interface to any modeling tool so that it can be integrated (for example, as an add-on or a plug-in) with that modeling tool. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Goodwin.

Goodwin discloses a system for automatically generated objects within extensible object frameworks. In particular, Goodwin discloses a method for generating source code objects that includes the steps of generating a plurality of logical models using a plurality of modeling tools; translating each of the plurality of logical models into corresponding unified models; generating a system definition comprising a plurality of templates, each defining at least one service within the framework; and generating source code objects as a function of said unified models and said templates. (Abstract). The method can be carried out in a system including a plurality of modeling tools and model adaptors, a repository adaptor tool for receiving logical models from the modeling tools and translating the logical models into unified models, a plurality of templates defining services, and a code generator for generating source code objects as a function of the templates and the unified model (Abstract). Unified models are expressed in a unified modeling language such as UML. (Column 8, Lines 52-54).

The above description suggests that, in Goodwin, the system generates a unified model for a logical model received from a modeling tool, and then uses that unified model to generate the source code. However, Goodwin does not appear to teach any additional design patterns. Nor does Goodwin appear to teach any enhancing of the unified model to conform to design patterns

- 12 -

while generating a unified model, or before code generation. As such, Goodwin does not appear to teach the feature of Claim 1 that the expert system therein reads a software application design UML model conforming to the software application design model tool, enhances the software application design UML model to conform to target application server design patterns, and generates code implementations for the target application server defined by the enhanced software application design UML model.

Furthermore, the above description suggests that, in Goodwin, the repository tool receives the logical models from the modeling tool and generates the unified model, before passing the model to the code generator. This suggests that the repository tool is a separate component from the others, and is not integrated into any of the modeling tools providing an interface for achieving the modeling. However, in accordance with the embodiment defined by Claim 1, the system therein provides an interface to a software application modeling tool so that it can be an integral part of that modeling tool.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 7, and 11-40

Claims 3-5, 7, and 11-40 have been canceled by the current Response, rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Claims 2, 6 and 8-10

Claims 2, 6 and 8-10 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims should be allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 6 and 8-10 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI.   Additional Amendments

Claims 41-55

Claims 41-55 have been newly added by the present Response. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 41-55 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

VII.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including April 23, 2005.

Application No.: 09/970,741
Response to OA dated: December 23, 2004
Response dated: April 1, 2005

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 1, 2005

By: _____

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 15 -